R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 016 249 24 CG 001 247

PERSONALITY ATTRIBUTES ASSOCIATED WITH VARIOUS MECHANISMS OF MASCULINE IDENTIFICATION.

BY- INSELBERG, RACHEL M. AND OTHERS
CARNEGIE INST. OF TECH., PITTSBURGH, PA.

REPORT NUMBER CRP-1770 PUB DATE 64
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$2.76 67P.

DESCRIPTORS- *MALES, *SEX (CHARACTERISTICS), *PERSONALITY ASSESSMENT, PARENT CHILD RELATIONSHIP, FATHERS, FAMILY INFLUENCE, KINDERGARTEN CHILDREN, RESEARCH PROJECTS, SELF CONCEPT, PEER RELATIONSHIP, DISCIPLINE,

THE PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF BOYS WHOSE MASCULINE IDENTIFICATION IS BASED ON ONE OF THREE MECHANISMS--FATHER'S NURTURANCE, FATHER'S PUNITIVENESS, OR FATHER'S NURTURANCE TOGETHER WITH HIS PUNITIVENESS WERE COMPARED. BOYS WITH VARYING MASCULINITY RATINGS WERE COMPARED ON THEIR PERCEPTION OF THE DEGREE OF PARENTAL NURTURANCE OR PUNITIVENESS, AND THEIR PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS, REPUTATIONS, AND SELF-CONCEPTS. BOYS WITH A MEAN AGE OF 67 MONTHS WERE ADMINISTERED THE IT SCALE FOR CHILDREN, THE CALIFORNIA TEST OF PERSONALITY, A TEST FOR ANXIETY REACTIONS, A TEST FOR SELF-CONCEPT AND PEER EVALUATION, AND A TEST FOR THE PERCEPTION OF PARENT-CHILD RELATIONSHIPS. NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES WERE FOUND IN THE PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF BOYS IN THE HIGH MASCULINITY RANGE WHO PERCEIVED THEIR FATHER AS EITHER NURTURANT OR PUNITIVE. PERSONALITY MECHANISMS OF HIGH MASCULINITY BOYS SEEM TO DEVELOP INDEPENDENTLY OF THE IDENTIFICATION MECHANISMS. THE EXISTENCE OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN BOYS IN THE HIGH, LOW, AND MIDDLE RANGES OF MASCULINITY WITH RESPECT TO THEIR PERCEPTION OF THE DEGREE OF PARENTS' PUNITIVENESS OR NURTURANCE WAS SUPPORTED BY THE DATA. LOW MASCULINITY BOYS SCORED LOWER THAN THE OTHER GROUPS IN THE PARENT NURTURANCE CATEGORIES. PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS, REPUTATIONS, AND SELF-CONCEPTS OF BOYS IN THE THREE RANGES OF MASCULINITY VARIED. (PS)

ED016249

Personality Attributes Associated With Various Mechanisms of Masculine Identification

Cooperative Research Project No. 1770

by

Rachel M. Inselberg

Laura Searls

Leocadia Burke

Carnegie Institute of Technology

N. BRN.
PA24
CRP 1770

PERSONALITY ATTRIBUTES ASSOCIATED WITH VARIOUS MECHANISMS OF MASCULINE IDENTIFICATION

Cooperative Research Project No. 1770

By

Rachel M. Inselberg, Ph. D.

Project Director

Laura Searls, B. S.

Leocadia Burke, M. S. W.

* * * * * *

Carnegie Institute of Technology

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213
1964

The research reported herein was supported by the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CG 001 247

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to express their appreciation to Dr. Merwin L. Himmler, Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Schools, Pittsburgh, the principals of the Pittsburgh Public Schools, and the boys who participated in the study for making this investigation possible through their cooperation.

R. M. I.

L. S.

L. B.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION.	1
	Purposes of the Study	4
	Related Research.	4
II.	DESIGN OF THE STUDY	13
	Hypotheses.	13
	Assumption.	14
	The Sample.	14
	Procedure in Collection of Data	16
	Tests Used.	16
III.	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.	23
	Present Results in Relation to Past Findings.	39
IV.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	42
APPENDICES		
A.	TEST FOR ANXIETY REACTIONS.	47
	TEST FOR SELF-CONCEPT AND PEER-EVALUATION	48
	TEST FOR PERCEPTION OF PARENT-CHILD RELATIONSHIPS . . .	51
B.	TABLES NOT INCLUDED IN THE TEXT	54
REFERENCES		57

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Fathers' Occupation by Prestige Levels.	15
2.	Personality Characteristics of Boys Rating High in Masculinity Who Perceive Their Father in Different Ways	26
3.	Personality Characteristics of High Masculinity Boys with Varying Degrees of Interaction with their Father	29
4.	Mean Scores of Boys with Varying Masculinity Ratings in Parent Perception Categories.	33
5.	Personality Characteristics of Boys with Varying Masculinity Ratings.	36
6.	Evaluation of Boys with Varying Masculinity Ratings by Their Peers	38
7.	Masculinity Ratings of Boys within a High Masculinity Range Who Perceive Their Father in Different Ways. . .	55
8.	Masculinity Ratings of Boys within a High Masculinity Range with Varying Degrees of Interaction with Their Father	55
9.	Comparison Between High and Low Masculinity Groups on Parent Perception Categories	55
10.	Correlation Between Masculinity and Personality Variables	56

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

While sex is biologically given, the variability in social sex roles from one culture to another suggests that the patterning of social and psychological behavior appropriate to one's sex is largely culturally determined. Various theories have been proposed to explain the acquisition of sex-typing behavior (6, 17, 18, 25, 30, 35). Through the process of identification with the same-sex parent and later on with other individuals of his own sex, a child is assumed to acquire sexually-appropriate characteristics.[1]

> A boy who has made a male identification is the boy who has happily and thoroughly adopted maleness as his way of life; he accepts and likes this state of affairs, its advantages and disadvantages; and he assumes the responsibilities that being male demands. His fantasy behavior is male, just as his sexual behavior, pattern of interests, and style of walking, talking, and gesturing are male (29, p. 338).

Similarly, a girl who has achieved a feminine identification is comfortable with her own femaleness, acts, feels and thinks in terms characteristic of her own sex. Her libidinal impulses are directed toward the opposite sex.

The first identificand of both boys and girls is believed to be the mother or the person taking care of them, usually a female (30). The basis for identification is the dependency relationship. As the child increases

---

[1]The term identification has been defined in various ways. See Sanford (40) for a listing of definitions. According to Freud (18, p. 62) who originated it, identification is the process whereby a child "endeavors to mold his own ego after the fashion of one that has been taken as a model."

in age, the mother starts to withhold rewards that she had previously given freely. Her absence may be more frequent. On account of his sense of helplessness and fear of losing the loved parent, in this case the mother, the young child is motivated to reproduce her behavior. The extent of identification, therefore, is a function of the child's desire to continue to obtain nurturance.

A boy, however, must change his model from a female to a male during the pre-school years, if he is to develop a masculine personality. The question that arises is what conditions or experiences promote the shift from a female to a male model.

According to the psychoanalytic theory, a boy is motivated to identify with his father during the oedipal phase because of fears of retaliation by a castrating and punitive father, who is viewed by the son as a rival in obtaining the mother's affection (17). This is known as defensive identification. Identification, in this case, is a function of the son's fear of an aggressive father. Thus, by identifying with the father, the boy "transforms himself from the person threatened into the person who makes the threat (17, p. 121)." His fears of counter-hostility disappear, and he obtains the mother's affection vicariously.

On the other hand, the developmental hypothesis suggests that identification with the father is promoted by a warm and affectionate relationship between father and son (30). For a son to want to be like his father, he must first of all like his father. If the father's actions have been nurturant and supportive, the son is motivated to "imitate" his behavior, in order to "reproduce pleasant experiences (43)."

While many studies support the hypothesis that a warm and affectionate father and son relationship is positively associated with masculinity on the

part of the son (7, 31, 37, 41), clinical observations show that some children minimize their anxieties by reproducing the behavior of the person who appears threatening to them (17).

These two suggested bases for masculine identification may not be mutually exclusive, but may complement each other in bringing about a boy's shift from a feminine to a masculine model. Parsons and other role theorists (5, 35, 43) hypothesized that identification is promoted by the power, or the reward value plus punishment potential, of the father.

> Given two... persons with whom one interacts and differ in power over the actor (the identifier), i.e. differ in the degree to which they control rewards and punishments for the actor, one would predict that the actor would adopt many of the characteristics of the powerful as contrasted to the less powerful person. This follows from the fact that it is more important to the actor to predict the behavior of the powerful figure, that he is motivated more strongly to take his role (i.e., to identify), that rewards and punishments are more impressive and the learning consequently better (5, p. 3).

The study by Mussen and Distler (32) on masculine identification lends support to the hypothesis advanced by the role theorists. Using the degree of masculinity as an index of identification, they found that boys who rated high in masculinity perceived their fathers as both nurturant and punitive. They suggest that "high nurturance from the father together with the threat of withdrawal of his love would lead to a strong father identification (32, p. 354)."

It is quite possible that boys who become masculine as a result of a combination of reward and punishment by the father differ in personality characteristics and self-concept from those attaining masculinity as a consequence of a warm relationship with their father or by means of punishment and threats. Accordingly, studies on parent-child relationships (2, 39, 47) reveal that children from autocratic homes tend to be quarrelsome, uncooperative and inconsiderate while children from democratic homes are active, outgoing, friendly, and are highly accepted by their peers.

Purposes of the Study

The primary objective was to evaluate the personality characteristics of boys whose masculine identification is based on the three mechanisms mentioned above. Specifically, do boys who rate high in masculinity and perceive their father as nurturant have more positive self-concepts and personality characteristics, as compared with those who also rate high in masculinity but perceive their father as either punitive or both punitive and nurturant?

Since only a fraction of the group of boys studied ~~were~~ was classified in the high masculinity range, two other objectives were formulated, utilizing the entire sample:

1. To compare boys with varying masculinity ratings with regard to their perceptions of the degree of nurturance or punitiveness of their parents.

2. To compare the personality characteristics, reputation, and self-conceptions of boys with varying masculinity ratings.

Related Research

While sex awareness is absent in most two-year-old children, it is developed in many three-and-a half year olds (13). By late pre-school age, boys prefer the masculine role, as demonstrated by several investigators. Sears (41) noted that boys used the father doll in doll play sessions more frequently than did the girls, use of the father doll being an index of masculine identification. Brown (8) found that a greater proportion of boys in contrast to girls, chose objects and activities characteristic of the male sex. Emmerich's (15) findings revealed a greater similarity between a father's and son's attitudes than between the attitudes of a mother and son.

Parents' Role in Sex-Typing of Boys

The developmental hypothesis of identification, namely, that masculine identification in a boy is promoted by nurturance on the part of the father, has been generally substantiated. In an investigation by Sears (41), five-year-old boys with warm and affectionate fathers identified more strongly with their fathers than those with fathers lacking in warmth. Similarly, adolescent boys responding to personality tests as their fathers did perceived their fathers as highly nurturant (37).

Mussen and Distler (31), who interviewed mothers of kindergarten-age boys, reported that highly masculine boys and their fathers were rated by the mothers as acting more affectionately toward each other than was the case with the less masculine boys and their fathers. Furthermore, the fathers of highly masculine boys took a greater role in rearing their sons.

The experiment conducted by Bandura and Huston (3), while not directly relevant, showed that nurturance on the part of an adult model facilitates social learning in children. Two groups of nursery school children were exposed to different kinds of models. In one group, the model was nurturant and responded to the child's request for help and attention whereas in the other group, the same model was distant and nonrewarding. Following the interaction sessions, a game was played by the model and child in which the model exhibited specific responses which were irrelevant to the game. A substantially greater proportion of the children who experienced nurturance reproduced the behavior of the model than did those exposed to a non-nurturant model.

Bronson (7) makes a distinction between infantile and ego identification. In infantile identification, the child wishes to be the security-giving

object, that is, the mother or the father, immediately, in order to escape the frustrations of reality. Under the stress of anxiety, the child reproduces an adult's behavior, believing that in a sort of magical way he is being transformed into that adult. On the other hand, in ego identification, the child perceives the differences between himself and the adult and aspires to be the security-giving object in the future. She hypothesized that boys with non-stressful relationships with their fathers would show signs of ego identification. Furthermore, boys manifesting ego identification would accept masculine attitudes and needs at a covert level while their overt behavior would be characterized by moderation in masculinity. The data obtained from boys, ranging in age from nine to 13 years, supported the hypothesis that compulsive overt masculinity or femininity was/were characteristic of boys having stressful relationships with their father, while the boys who had non-stressful relationships with their fathers rated higher in acceptance of covert masculinity.

The above studies suggest that warmth on the father's part facilitates masculine identification in a boy. A study by Mussen and Distler (32), however, provides support for the power theory of identification. While the highly masculine boys perceived their father as more nurturant than did boys who rated low in masculinity, the former also perceived their father as more punitive, although the difference in this case was not as significant. When both scores on father nurturance and father punishment were combined to obtain a score of "father power," the highly masculine group did in fact perceive their father as more powerful, that is, he was a source of reward as well as punishment.

According to Mowrer (30), in an ideal family situation, a boy finds it rewarding to model himself after his father. The father, in turn, derives

satisfaction from seeing the re-creation of his qualities, while the mother, in her love of the father, approves of such a course of development. Appropriate sex-role identification in a boy is therefore rewarded and reinforced. The families of highly masculine boys in the Mussen and Distler study (31) were rated as permissive, easy-going, and love-oriented. Sears (41) found that boys who chose the mother role in a doll play situation and were not appropriately sex-typed had mothers who were critical of their husbands.

The trend toward fusion of male and female roles in the performance of household tasks is believed to promote confusion in sex-role identification (46). However, highly masculine boys have been shown to come from families where there is a greater tendency for parents to help with all tasks and where there are fewer mother- and father-designated tasks than in families of less masculine boys (31). More parents of appropriately sex-identified boys claim that both parents assume responsibility for disciplining their children (28).

Apparently, fathers with highly masculine interests and attitudes do not necessarily promote a high degree of masculinity in their sons (1, 33). Fathers of highly masculine boys were not found to be significantly more masculine than fathers of less masculine boys. This, of course, does not negate the influence of the father in fostering masculine identification in his son. It is quite possible that a somewhat effeminate but otherwise adequate father can promote proper sex-role identification in his son. The son, being secure in his maleness, does not have a need to copy his father's behavior slavishly and can emulate the behavior of other men. On the other hand, a ruggedly masculine but poor father could impede masculine identification in his son. Bronson (7) found that the overt masculinity scores of

boys having stressful relationships with their fathers were negatively correlated with those of the fathers. This same group of boys also scored low in covert acceptance of masculinity.

Findings on the role of the mother in sex-typing of boys are contradictory. In the Mussen and Distler study (32) of kindergarten boys, those rating high and those rating low in masculinity did not differ in their perception of the degree of nurturance or punitiveness of the mother. They concluded that sex-typing in boys is largely determined by the interaction of boys with their fathers. This conclusion was also substantiated by the Mussen and Rutherford study (33) on first-grade boys.

On the other hand, Lefkowitz (28) who interviewed parents of third and fourth-grade boys found that a higher proportion of parents of boys manifesting sex-deviation than those of non-deviant boys indicated that the mother was the chief disciplinarian. He concluded that boys identified with the masculine role may be depicted as having nurturant mothers. In another study using data from interviews with mothers (31), highly masculine kindergarten boys were spanked to a lesser extent by their mothers, as compared with boys who were less masculine. The inconsistency in the findings could perhaps be explained by the differences in the perception of the mothers and boys and the age difference of boys used as subjects.

Contradictory findings also seem to characterize the relationship of boys' sexual identification and the degree of femininity or masculinity of their mothers. Feminine mothers did not necessarily contribute to the development of masculine assurance in pre-school (1) nor in first-grade boys (33). But in a study of boys in junior and senior high school (37), relatively masculine mothers appeared to inhibit male identification in their sons. Among male college students, the more masculine a student, the lesser was the likelihood of his ascribing masculine values to his mother,

while the more effeminate attributed more masculine values to their mothers (4). These studies are, of course, not strictly comparable since varying age groups were investigated.

Studies on the association of parental sex-typing behavior with sex-role identification in children should take into account overt characteristics, as well as unconscious acceptance or rejection of one's sex. It is possible that a mother who is somewhat masculine in overt characteristics but feels comfortable with her femaleness may not necessarily contribute to sex-role confusion in her son.

The Influence of Social Class

Since husband-wife roles differ according to social class (10), one would expect sex-typing to be influenced by one's class placement. Rabban (38) compared working-class with upper-middle class children, ranging in age from two-and-a-half to eight years, and found that working-class children were appropriately sex-typed sooner than middle-class children. Working-class boys were clearly identified with masculine interests at four and five years of age, in contrast to upper-middle class boys who manifested appropriate sex-typed behavior at six years of age.

Rabban speculates that the flexibility in sex-role patterns and expectations in the upper middle-class may account for the later-age conformance of upper middle-class boys to sex-appropriate behavior. In the early years, upper middle-class boys and girls are treated similarly and parents in this group place less emphasis on clear-cut sex-appropriate behavior. In the lower class, on the other hand, sex roles are more rigidly defined and deviation from the norm could lead to punishment by parents and ridicule by the peer group.

Contrary to the above findings, Fauls and Smith (16) noted that middle-class boys and girls did not show confusion in sex-appropriate behavior at about the age of five years. Neither did Hartup and Zook (24) find that lower-class children were more clearly sex-typed than middle-class youngsters, in their study of three- and four-year-old nursery school children.

To avoid confusion regarding what is truly masculine or feminine behavior, especially in socio-economic groups where sex roles are fluid, Lefkowitz (28) allowed his subjects, in this case third and fourth graders, to act as arbiters of what is or is not sex-appropriate behavior. Sex-role deviation was defined as "divergence from the mode of one's own sex but not necessarily in the direction of the mode of the opposite sex." The children of each sex were divided into deviant and non-deviant groups. His findings showed that non-deviance in sex-role was related to upper-class status. Evidently, investigations on the influence of social class need to take into account the prevailing definitions of male and female roles in different social classes. It is possible that a middle-class boy may be appropriately sex-typed in his own group but may deviate from the norms of the lower class.

The Role of Siblings

The influence of siblings on sex-typing is still not clear. Brim (5), in his analysis of Helen Koch's data, reported cross-sex role-taking among five- and six-year-old children with siblings of the opposite sex. The effect of siblings was particularly noticeable with the younger child having an older sibling of the opposite sex. Brown (8) reported some degree of femininity in boys with sisters only.

In contrast, in a study by Fauls and Smith (16), the presence of like-sex siblings failed to facilitate sex-appropriate activity choices among five-year-olds. Only children chose sex-appropriate activities more often than

did children with older like-sex siblings. A close agreement between the children's play activity choices and their perception of parental preferences, regardless of sex-appropriateness, occurred more often in only children than with children having siblings.

Masculinity and other Personality Characteristics

In general, studies have shown a positive relationship between masculine identification in boys and favorable personality characteristics. Mussen and Distler (31) found that highly masculine kindergarten boys were less attention-seeking, and therefore less dependent, than their peers who were low in masculinity. In a study by Gray (22) of sixth and seventh graders, highly masculine boys, as rated by their peers, were also rated high in social acceptance, leadership, and friendship but low in withdrawing tendencies.

In another study by Gray (23), children in grades five to eight indicated from a list of adjectives and phrases those characterizing them and their parents. The perceived similarity between oneself and a parent was used as an index of identification. The data on the boys demonstrated that those low in identification with the father were rated by their classmates as low in leadership and friendship but high in withdrawing tendencies. However, she also found that among seventh- and eighth-grade boys and girls, those who perceived themselves as being dissimilar from the parent of the same sex were viewed as better adjusted by their peers. Apparently, seeing oneself as dissimilar from one's parents in adolescence is an indication of one's growing independence.

Sopchak's (44) data for college men and women showed that identification with one's parents, as indicated by perceived similarity to them, was associated with normality and adjustment. His male subjects with tendencies toward

abnormalities showed a greater lack of identification with either their fathers or mothers than the normal males. This lack of identification was also evident in relationships with people in general.

The relationship between appropriate sex-typing behavior or identification with the same-sex parent and anxiety is not definite. In Gray's study (22), a high level of anxiety was related to sex-appropriate behavior. Webb's (48) study of junior high-school boys and girls revealed that a high level of anxiety was associated with a high degree of femininity among eighth grade boys, while among ninth grade boys, the opposite relationship prevailed, high anxiety and low femininity being associated. At the college level, an investigation by Lazowick (27) showed that a higher degree of identification with the same-sex parent was related to a lower anxiety level. Further research is necessary, taking into account the possible interaction of age and sex-typing behavior in determining the anxiety level.

Chapter II

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

A sample of kindergarten-age boys, all rating high in masculinity, was divided into three groups: (1) those who perceived their father as nurturant, (2) those who perceived their father as punitive, and (3) those who perceived their father as both punitive and nurturant. These groups were compared according to their self-conceptions and other selected personality characteristics. Three other groups of boys (including those mentioned above), classified as high, low, and in the middle range according to a measure of masculinity, were also compared with respect to their perceptions of the degree of nurturance or punitiveness of their parents, their self-conceptions, other selected personality characteristics, and their peers' rating of them.

All boys included in the study were white Americans of kindergarten age, from intact families and from households including only parents and their children.

Hypotheses

1. Significant differences will be found in the self-conceptions and other selected personality characteristics of boys who rate high in masculinity and (a) perceive their father as nurturant, (b) perceive their father as punitive, and (c) perceive their father as both punitive and nurturant.

2. Significant differences will be found between boys rating high, low, and in the middle range of masculinity with respect to their perception of the degree of nurturance or punitiveness of their parents.

3. Significant differences will be found between boys rating high, low, and in the middle range of masculinity with respect to (a) their self-conceptions, (b) other selected personality characteristics, and (c) their peers' rating of them.

Assumption

In young boys, appropriate sex-typing of interests is a manifestation of identification with the father. Accordingly, the extent of identification can be estimated from the degree of sex-typing behavior.

The Sample

Criteria for Selection of the Sample

In order to render the groups studied comparable, it was specified that all boys should be white, native-born Americans of kindergarten age, and attending the City of Pittsburgh Public Schools. They should also come from families unbroken by divorce, death, or separation, and from households which included only parents and their children. If socio-economic status, as indicated by the fathers' occupations, were found to be associated with differences in degrees of masculinity, it would be controlled.

Method of Selection

A list of 55 schools with kindergarten and with 75% or more white pupils was prepared by the Pittsburgh Board of Education. From this list, a random selection of 20 schools was made. Potential subjects were randomly selected from a list of boys qualifying for the study, which was obtained from kindergarten teachers in the selected schools.

Sample Studied

A total of 335 boys participated in the study, 326 of whom were completely tested while 9 boys were only partially tested because of absenteeism, refusal to participate further, or the absence of satisfactory snapshots of them needed for one of the tests. Two boys originally selected refused to take part.

All boys were white, native-born Americans. Their mean age was 67 months. All came from unbroken families and households including only

parents and their children. Four percent of the 335 boys were only children, 56% had one or two siblings, and 40% had three or more siblings.

Five percent of the boys had mothers who were employed outside the home. The occupations of the fathers were rated according to prestige using the North-Hatt Scale (34), the mean occupational rating being 63.5. The scheme devised by Clarke (11), in which he assigned prestige levels to groupings of the North-Hatt occupational ratings, was followed.[2] Level I with occupational ratings from 82 to 96 includes professional people. Level II, from 75 to 81, is made up of managers, officials, and proprietors, while Level III, from 67 to 74, includes sales and clerical workers, as well as white-collar employees. Skilled craftsmen and related occupations are included in Level IV, with ratings from 55 to 66, while service workers, semi-skilled and unskilled laborers comprise the major portion of Level V, with ratings of 54 and under.

The frequency distribution of the fathers' occupations, according to prestige level is given in Table 1. About two-thirds of the boys had fathers who were skilled craftsmen or semi-skilled and unskilled laborers.

TABLE 1

FATHERS' OCCUPATIONS BY PRESTIGE LEVELS

Prestige Level	Percent	Number
I & II	9.9	33
III	23.6	79
IV	46.6	156
V	20.0	67
Total	100.1	335

[2]Clarke (11) defined prestige level as "a category of persons with occupations of somewhat similar prestige status."

Procedure in Collection of Data

Each boy was tested individually at school during school hours. Any writing or marking in connection with the tests was done by the tester. Ninety-one percent of the boys were tested in two sessions. The tests were administered to the remaining nine percent in three sessions, because one of the tests required the use of snapshots which were not always ready when the test was scheduled to be given to a particular child. For boys having two sessions of testing, the mean number of days between the sessions was 19. The tests were administered by the authors. Ninety-six percent of the boys had the same tester throughout. Personal data on the subjects and their families were obtained from the teachers.

Tests Used

During the first testing session, the It Scale for Children (ITSC), the California Test of Personality, and a test for anxiety reactions were administered. During the second session, a test for self-concept and peer-evaluation, and a test for a boy's perception of the degree of punitiveness or nurturance of his parents were given.[3] A break was given to a child in the middle of each session or whenever fatigue was evident.

1. The It Scale for Children

The It Scale for Children (8) was used to test for the degree of masculinity. It consists of 36 picture cards showing various objects, figures, and activities commonly associated with feminine or masculine roles. The child is given a card with a stick-figure drawing, unstructured as to sex and referred to as It. The subject is then shown these cards and asked to make choices for It.

---

[3]For additional details concerning the tests, see Appendix A.

The assumption is made that the child, in making choices for It, projects himself or herself onto It. The possible range of scores is from 0 to 84, corresponding, respectively, to the extreme feminine and masculine scores.

2. The California Test of Personality

The California Test of Personality, Primary Form AA (9), was used to determine the degree of one's adjustment. The first half of the test, designated as Personal Adjustment, is devised to measure six components: self-reliance, sense of personal worth, sense of personal freedom, feeling of belonging, freedom from withdrawing tendencies, and freedom from nervous symptoms. Items on the second half of the test, known as Social Adjustment, are designed to measure six components: social standards, social skills, freedom from anti-social tendencies, family relations, school relations, and community relations.

A total adjustment score is obtained by summing the personal and social adjustment scores. Sub-scores for each of the components are also computed. Higher scores indicate a better degree of adjustment.

3. Test for Anxiety Reactions

The test for anxiety reactions employs the projective technique to reveal areas of anxiety in young children (14). It consists of fourteen $8\frac{1}{2}$" x 11" pictures depicting child-child relationships, child-adult relationships, and adjustment to routines. The assumption is made that the child will identify with the central figure, in this case the boy, in each of the 14 pictures. The face of the central figure in each picture is left blank and two drawings of heads, one with a happy face and one with a sad face, are provided for each picture. The child is asked to select one of the heads to complete a picture.

The 14 pictures are presented in the following sequence:

1. Play with younger children
2. Child with mother and baby
3. Object of aggression
4. Dressing
5. Play with other children
6. Going to bed alone
7. Toileting
8. Scolding
9. Neglect
10. Aggressive attack
11. Picking up toys
12. Isolation
13. Child with parents
14. Eating alone

When a picture is presented, a question is asked, for example, with picture 6, Going to bed alone, "What kind of a face do you suppose this child will have, a sad face or a happy face?"

The anxiety score is determined by dividing the number of unhappy responses by the total number of pictures. Sub-scores for each of the three areas, (child-adult relationships, child-child relationships, and routines) are obtained by dividing the number of unhappy responses in a given area by the total number of pictures in that area. The higher the score the higher is the level of anxiety.

4. <u>The Test for Self-Concept and Peer-Evaluation</u>

The test for self-concept and peer-evaluation was based on a test developed at Stanford University, for use with primary school children.

Each child was asked to rate himself and four of his classmates included in the study on a three-point rating scale in the following areas: art, physical ability, physical appearance, ability to share, happy qualities, good ideas, paying attention, having friends. The first area, school work (reading, writing, and arithmetic), in the original form was not included, as it was not applicable to the present subjects.

The child being tested was, first of all, presented with three attractively decorated boxes and asked to choose the box he liked best, second

best, and least of all. Large numbers indicating his choices were placed on the boxes. He was shown five snapshots, one of which was his, while the others were of some of his classmates participating in the study. The snapshots were selected in such a way as to have a boy evaluated by at least three of his peers.

Each area was described, in turn, and an appropriate 8½" x 11" drawing in color was presented. For example, in the case of "art", a drawing of a boy painting was shown. The subject was asked to put the pictures of the boys (including his own) who were best in art in box No. 1, the boys who were good but not best in box No. 2, and those who were not good in art in box No. 3. The procedure was repeated for the remaining areas.

A score of three in each area was assigned to the best rating; a score of two and one were given to the second best and lowest ratings, respectively. The self-concept score of a child was obtained by adding the numerical equivalents of his ratings of himself in all eight areas, the highest possible score being 24. A peer rating of a child was obtained in the same manner.

5. Test for Perception of Parent-Child Relationships

To measure a child's perception of the degree of nurturance or punitiveness of his parents, each boy was given a structured doll-play session. The procedure followed was the one used by Mussen and Distler in their study of kindergarten-age boys (32).

The examiner presented the boy with three easily manipulated dolls, representing a mother, a father, and a boy, and with some toy furniture placed on a table in the testing room. The subject was told that these objects were to be used in a game in which the examiner would make up the first part of a story which the boy would complete.

The tester then presented, with appropriate manipulations of the dolls, a series of nine incomplete stories depicting family situations, and the

child was asked to complete each one. Through the story-telling technique, the child could portray either or both of his parents as nurturant and/or punitive.

If the child failed to respond to one of the stories or said, "I don't know," the story was repeated or the question phrased in a different manner. If the subject failed to mention the parents in his story, the examiner asked, "What did the mommy or daddy say or do?" If no specific parent was designated in a response, the examiner would say, "Who did that, the mommy or the daddy?" Responses were recorded verbatim in writing by the examiner. Initially, a tape recorder was used for this purpose. However, some children seemed threatened by it; hence, its use was discontinued.

Each story was scored for manifestations of nurturance, punishment, over-permissiveness, and neutral responses on the part of the mother and the father. The scoring categories used were[4] -

Father Nurturance (FN) was the total number of stories in which the boy was helped, comforted, or reassured by the father, e.g. "The daddy got the toy," in response to story 1.[5]

Mother Nurturance (MN) was obtained by summing the number of stories in which the mother was represented as being nurturant, e.g. "Mommy will fix the toy for him," in response to story 8.

Total Nurturance (TN) was the sum of the Mother Nurturance (MN) and Father Nurturance (FN) scores.

The total number of stories in which the father or mother admonished, criticized, or spanked the boy, represented, respectively, the Father

---

[4]The scoring system used differed slightly from that used by Mussen and Distler (32).

[5]A list of the story beginnings is given in Appendix A.

Punishment (FP) and Mother Punishment (MP) scores. Total Punishment (TP) was the sum of the Mother Punishment and Father Punishment scores.

The Mother Nurturance and Mother Punishment scores were added to obtain the Mother Power (M Pow) scores. Correspondingly, the Father Nurturance and Father Punishment scores were combined to get the Father Power (F Pow) score.

The total number of stories in which the mother or father punished the boy physically, such as spanking, slapping, or kicking, constituted the Mother Physical Punishment score (MPP) and Father Physical Punishment score (FPP), respectively.

Scores on Mother Overpermissiveness (MOP) and Father Overpermissiveness (FOP) were determined by adding the stories in which the mother and the father, respectively, showed overindulgence or inability to set limits for the boy, e.g. "Daddy says, 'the boy can stay up as long as he wants to'," in response to story 4.

Mother Neutral Response (M Nt) or Father Neutral Response (F Nt) was obtained by summing the number of stories in which the mother or the father, respectively, interacted with the boy but was neither nurturant, overindulgent, nor punitive or a given parent interacted with the boy in a manner that was not relevant to the situation depicted in a story. For example, "Mommy says 'it's time for bath'," in response to story 9.

A given story could be scored for more than one attribute. To illustrate, if the mother spanked the boy, the story was scored M P. If she comforted him afterwards, in the same story, then it was also scored M N.

Mother Interaction (MI) was the total number of stories in which the mother interacted with the boy, regardless of the nature of the interaction. Correspondingly, Father Interaction (FI) was obtained by counting the number of stories in which the father interacted with the boy. Neutral responses were included in the Mother Interaction and Father Interaction categories.

The maximum score possible for most of the categories was 9, except for Total Nurturance, Total Punishment, Mother Power, and Father Power, where it was 18.

Two individuals rated the story completions. Ninety-six percent of their ratings were in agreement.

Chapter III

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Personality Characteristics In Relation To Mechanisms of Masculine Identification

As indicated in Chapter I, various theories suggest three mechanisms promoting masculine identification in a boy: (1) warmth and nurturance of the father, (2) punitiveness of the father, and (3) nurturance together with punitiveness of the father. In view of the studies on parent-child relationships (2, 39, 47) showing differences in the personality characteristics of children brought up in democratic homes and those of children reared in autocratic homes, the study was concerned with evaluating the personality characteristics of boys whose masculine identification is based on each of the above-mentioned three mechanisms. It was hypothesized that significant differences would be found in the self-conceptions and other personality characteristics of boys, all rating high in masculinity, who perceived their father differently: (1) as nurturant, (2) as punitive, and (3) as both punitive and nurturant.

To test the hypothesis, boys having a masculinity score from 79 to 84, totaling 136, were included in the high masculinity group. The cutting point was selected so that the highly masculine boys would have the same range of It Scale for Children (ITSC) scores as that of boys considered highly masculine in the Mussen and Distler study (32).

For the entire sample of 333 boys given the test for the perception of parent-child relationships, the third quartile for Father Nurturance

was 4.1 and that for Father Punishment was 6.3. Among the high masculinity boys, those perceiving their father as nurturant (HFN, LFP Group) were defined as those having Father Nurturance scores from 4 to 9 and Father Punishment scores from 0 to 5. Those perceiving their father as punitive (LFN, HFP Group) were defined as those having Father Nurturance scores from 0 to 3 and Father Punishment scores from 6 to 9. It was intended that boys perceiving their father as both nurturant and punitive, that is, as powerful, would be defined as those having Father Nurturance scores from 4 to 9 and Father Punishment scores from 6 to 9.[6] However, none of the high masculinity boys could be classified under this category. In fact, only 4 of the total sample of 333 boys were in this category. This was probably to be expected, as the extremes of the two variables are diametrically opposed and few adults would be likely to exhibit such extreme behavioral inconsistencies.

In the analysis of data, another group of high masculinity boys (LFN, LFP Group), those having Father Nurturance scores of 0 to 3 and Father Punishment scores of 0 to 5, was also included, since data on them were available and it was of interest to find out how they compared with the other boys. This group corresponded roughly to the low 75 percent of the sample according to both Father Nurturance and Father Punishment.

To determine the significance of differences in the self-conceptions and other selected personality characteristics of the three groups of boys, *t* tests were performed. The fathers' occupational ratings were

---

[6]It should be noted that in the Mussen and Distler study (32), the highly masculine boys perceived their father as more nurturant and more punitive than did the boys who were relatively feminine.

not found to be associated with masculinity, r = 0.02; hence, socio-economic status was not controlled in any of the comparisons that follow.

Data on the personality characteristics of the three groups of boys are presented in Table 2.[7] Out of 45 comparisons on personality characteristics measured by the California Test of Personality, only one significant difference emerged. Their self-conceptions were also similar, all groups having rather positive self-concepts (the highest score possible is 24). Again, no significant difference was found in their level of anxiety.

Since none of the relatively masculine boys perceived their father as both highly nurturant and highly punitive, that is, as powerful, the boys were classified into three groups according to the extent of their perceived interaction with their father (Father Interaction score), and differences in their personality characteristics were investigated.

Mussen and Distler (32), in interpreting the power theory of identification, stated that

> A high level of masculine identification does not appear to depend on any specific type of father-son relationship. From the child's point of view, the significant factor seems to be the father's salience - his importance in the child's life - rather than the particular techniques he uses in dealing with his child.

Bronfenbrenner (6), in summarizing the power theory, advanced a similar interpretation:

> Parsons' picture of the father as executive rather than punitive suggests also a variant of Freud's theory of identification with the aggressor. The fact that the father exercises power and control over the environment may in itself invite emulation. To the extent that an exploratory or activity drive exists..., a living example of patterns of action for expressing this drive may be sufficient to motivate the child to adopt an analogous pattern in his own behavior. Given the possibility of such a mechanism, a child whose father, or mother, was

---

[7]The mean masculinity scores of the three groups of boys are given in Table 7, Appendix B.

TABLE 2

PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF BOYS RATING HIGH IN MASCULINITY WHO PERCEIVE THEIR FATHER IN DIFFERENT WAYS

Personality Variable	Mean		p†	Mean		p	Mean		p
	HFN LFP*	LFN HFP**		LFN HFP	LFN LFP‡		HFN LFP	LFN LFP	
California Test of Personality									
Self-Reliance	6.00	5.55	<0.30	5.55	6.21	<0.01	6.00	6.21	n.s.
Sense of Personal Worth	6.63	6.19	<0.30	6.19	6.43	n.s.	6.63	6.43	n.s.
Sense of Personal Freedom	6.33	6.13	n.s.	6.13	6.25	n.s.	6.33	6.25	n.s.
Feeling of Belonging	6.90	6.74	n.s.	6.74	6.77	n.s.	6.90	6.77	n.s.
Freedom from Withdrawing Tendencies	5.57	5.61	n.s.	5.61	5.92	n.s.	5.57	5.92	n.s.
Freedom from Nervous Symptoms	5.30	5.35	n.s.	5.35	5.40	n.s.	5.30	5.40	n.s.
Total Personal Adjustment	36.73	35.58	n.s.	35.58	36.99	<0.30	36.73	36.99	n.s.
Social Standards	6.40	6.03	n.s.	6.03	6.39	<0.30	6.40	6.39	n.s.
Social Skills	6.13	6.06	n.s.	6.06	6.29	n.s.	6.13	6.29	n.s.
Freedom from Anti-Social Tendencies	5.23	5.42	n.s.	5.42	5.75	n.s.	5.23	5.75	<0.30
Family Relations	6.30	6.87	<0.20	6.87	6.41	<0.20	6.30	6.41	n.s.
School Relations	6.10	6.26	n.s.	6.26	6.37	n.s.	6.10	6.37	n.s.
Community Relations	6.10	6.55	<0.20	6.55	6.39	n.s.	6.10	6.39	n.s.
Total Social Adjustment	36.27	37.19	n.s.	37.19	37.60	n.s.	36.27	37.60	n.s.
Total Adjustment	73.00	72.77	n.s.	72.77	74.59	n.s.	73.00	74.59	n.s.

*HFN, LFP refers to 30 boys perceiving their fathers as nurturant.
**LFN, HFP refers to 31 boys perceiving their fathers as punitive.
†Probabilities given are for two - tailed t tests.
‡LFN, LFP corresponds to 75 boys perceiving their father as relatively low in nurturance and punishment.

TABLE 2 - Continued

Personality Variable	Mean		p	Mean		p	Mean		p
	HFN LFP	LFN HFP		LFN HFP	LFN LFP		HFN LFP	LFN LFP	
Self-Concept*	22.13	21.86	n.s.	21.86	21.47	n.s.	22.13	21.47	<0.30
Test for Anxiety Reactions									
Routines	0.25	0.30	n.s.	0.30	0.28	n.s.	0.25	0.28	n.s.
Child-Adult	0.42	0.38	n.s.	0.38	0.41	n.s.	0.42	0.41	n.s.
Child-Child	0.49	0.53	n.s.	0.53	0.50	n.s.	0.49	0.50	n.s.
Total Anxiety	0.38	0.40	n.s.	0.40	0.40	n.s.	0.38	0.40	n.s.

*Since satisfactory snapshots were not available for a few of the boys, the number of boys given the self-concept test was 29 for the LFN, HFP Group and 74 for the LFN, LFP Group. The number of boys in the HFN, LFP Group remained the same, 30.

> especially active in the manipulation of the environment, either through direct activity, or through the exercise of power (e.g., making plans, decisions, etc.) might be expected to emulate the parents' behavior, even without reinforcement through "denial of reciprocity" and "manipulation of rewards."

The assumption was made that the degree of interaction with the father, as perceived by the son, was closely related to the actual extent of interaction. For the group of 333 boys given the test for perception of parent-child relationships, the third quartile for Father Interaction was 8.4 and the first quartile was 6.3. Among the high masculinity boys, those perceiving a high degree of interaction with the father (High Father Interaction Group) were defined as those having Father Interaction scores from 8 to 9. Boys perceiving a low degree of interaction with the father (Low Father Interaction Group) were defined as those having Father Interaction scores from 0 to 6. Those perceiving a moderate degree of interaction with the father (Moderate Father Interaction Group) were defined as those having a Father Interaction score of 7.

Comparisons on the personality characteristics of high masculinity boys interacting to a different extent with their father are shown in Table 3.[8] The three groups were similar in their degree of adjustment and also in the specific personality characteristics measured, except in a few instances. Boys perceiving a high degree of interaction with the father had a significantly greater feeling of belonging than those perceiving a low degree of interaction with the father. Perhaps, in the case of high masculinity boys, fathers who spend a good deal of time with their sons make them feel more wanted and help promote in them a more generalized feeling of belonging. In accord with this interpretation, the High Father Interaction Group also tended to have a greater sense of personal worth than the Low Father

---

[8]The mean masculinity scores of the groups, classified according to Father Interaction are given in Table 8, Appendix B.

TABLE 3

PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF HIGH MASCULINITY BOYS
WITH VARYING DEGREES OF INTERACTION
WITH THEIR FATHER

Personality Variable	Mean			Mean			Mean		
	HFI*	LFI**	p†	LFI	MFI‡	p	HFI	MFI	p
California Test of Personality									
Self-Reliance	5.79	6.30	<0.10	6.30	6.03	n.s.	5.79	6.03	n.s.
Sense of Personal Worth	6.67	6.11	<0.10	6.11	6.35	n.s.	6.67	6.35	n.s.
Sense of Personal Freedom	6.28	6.32	n.s.	6.32	6.09	n.s.	6.28	6.09	n.s.
Feeling of Belonging	7.07	6.54	<0.05	6.54	6.65	n.s.	7.07	6.65	<0.10
Freedom from Withdrawing Tendencies	5.66	5.68	n.s.	5.68	6.09	n.s.	5.66	6.09	n.s.
Freedom from Nervous Symptoms	5.24	5.32	n.s.	5.32	5.65	n.s.	5.24	5.65	n.s.
Total Personal Adjustment	36.70	36.27	n.s.	36.27	36.85	n.s.	36.70	36.85	n.s.
Social Standards	6.41	6.34	n.s.	6.34	6.09	n.s.	6.41	6.09	n.s.
Social Skills	6.38	6.25	n.s.	6.25	5.85	n.s.	6.38	5.85	<0.20
Freedom from Anti-Social Tendencies	5.55	5.91	n.s.	5.91	5.12	<0.10	5.55	5.12	n.s.
Family Relations	6.55	6.59	n.s.	6.59	6.26	n.s.	6.55	6.26	n.s.
School Relations	6.55	6.43	n.s.	6.43	5.65	<0.05	6.55	5.65	<0.01
Community Relations	6.41	6.34	n.s.	6.34	6.29	n.s.	6.41	6.29	n.s.
Total Social Adjustment	37.85	37.86	n.s.	37.86	35.26	<0.10	37.85	35.26	<0.10
Total Adjustment	74.55	74.14	n.s.	74.14	72.12	n.s.	74.55	72.12	n.s.

*HFI refers to High Father Interaction Group made up of 58 boys.
**LFI refers to Low Father Interaction Group consisting of 44 boys.
†Probabilities given are for two - tailed t tests.
‡MFI corresponds to Moderate Father Interaction Group composed of 34 boys.

TABLE 3 - Continued

Personality Variable	Mean		p	Mean		p	Mean		p
	HFI	LFI		LFI	MFI		HFI	MFI	
Self-Concept* - - - - - - - -	22.01	21.70	n.s.	21.70	21.24	n.s.	22.01	21.24	<0.20
Test for Anxiety Reactions									
Routines - - - - - - - -	0.26	0.29	n.s.	0.29	0.29	n.s.	0.26	0.29	n.s.
Child-Adult - - - - - - -	0.41	0.44	n.s.	0.44	0.38	n.s.	0.41	0.38	n.s.
Child-Child - - - - - - -	0.51	0.48	n.s.	0.48	0.52	n.s.	0.51	0.52	n.s.
Total Anxiety- - -	0.39	0.39	n.s.	0.39	0.39	n.s.	0.39	0.39	n.s.

*Satisfactory snapshots were not available for some of the boys; hence, in the HFI Group, the total number of boys was 56 and for the LFI Group, it was 43. The number of boys in the MFI Group remained the same, 34.

Interaction Group.

Boys perceiving a moderate degree of interaction with their father scored significantly lower than the two extreme groups in school relations, while the high and low groups were similar.[9] It is not clear why the Moderate Father Interaction Group was less adjusted at school than the Low Father Interaction Group, if it is presumed that father-son interaction has a favorable effect on the personality development of a boy. On the other hand, the Low Father Interaction Group, lacking somewhat in a sense of personal worth and a feeling of belonging, may compensate for this by trying hard to get along with others in order to be accepted and to acquire a sense of belonging. This interpretation is suggested by Coppersmith's study (12) of fifth- and sixth-grade children. He found that children who thought poorly of themselves but who were regarded highly by their teachers, were popular with their peers although self-critical. Accordingly, the Low Father Interaction Group tended to be better adjusted socially than the Moderate Father Interaction Group, but did not differ in the degree of social adjustment from the High Father Interaction Group. The High Father Interaction Group tended to be better adjusted socially than the Moderate Father Interaction Group, as might be expected.

No significant differences were noted in the boys' level of anxiety. While there were few differences in the personality characteristics of the three groups of boys, whenever such differences were found, they tended to favor the boys having a relatively high degree of interaction with their father.

---

[9] Items devised to test "school relations" pertained generally to getting along with one's peers at school and with one's teacher.

Boys with Varying Masculinity Ratings
and Their Perception of Parents

In order to utilize the data on the entire sample of 335 boys, it was hypothesized that significant differences would be found between boys rating high, low, and in the middle range of masculinity with respect to their perception of the degree of punitiveness or nurturance of their parents. To test the hypothesis, the boys were divided into three groups. The High Masculinity Group consisted of 89 boys with a masculinity score of 84, who were approximately in the top 25 percent according to masculinity. Boys who were approximately in the middle 50 percent, with masculinity scores from 65 to 83, made up the Intermediate Masculinity Group. The Low Masculinity Group was composed of boys who were roughly in the Low 25 percent, with masculinity scores from 0 to 64.[10]

The mean scores of the boys with varying masculinity ratings in the parent perception categories are shown in Table 4.[11] While the three groups of boys did not differ significantly in Mother Nurturance, Father Nurturance, and Total Nurturance, the Low Masculinity Group scored consistently lower in these categories than the High and Intermediate Masculinity Groups. The boys in the Low Masculinity Group also tended to perceive their parents as more punitive than the boys in the two other groups. Furthermore, the Low Masculinity Group boys perceived their mothers as significantly harsher in punishing, as indicated by a higher Mother Physical Punishment score, than the High Masculinity Group boys did.

---

[10]The mean masculinity ratings for the High, Intermediate, and Low Masculinity Groups were 84, 75, and 48, respectively.

[11]The White Test (nonparametric) was employed in testing the significance of differences between the High and Low Masculinity Groups with regard to Mother Physical Punishment, Father Physical Punishment, Mother Overpermissiveness and Father Overpermissiveness since the distribution of scores was skewed in each case. The probabilities obtained are given in Table 9, Appendix B and are similar to the ones reported in Table 4, using t tests.

TABLE 4

MEAN SCORES OF BOYS WITH VARYING MASCULINITY RATINGS IN PARENT PERCEPTION CATEGORIES

Category	Mean		p†	Mean		p	Mean		p
	High Masc. Group* n=89	Low Masc. Group** n=96		Low Masc. Group n=96	Int. Masc. Group‡ n=148		High Masc. Group n=89	Int. Masc. Group n=148	
Mother Nurturance	1.57	1.46	n.s.	1.46	1.56	n.s.	1.57	1.56	n.s.
Father Nurturance	2.31	2.08	n.s.	2.08	2.34	<0.20	2.31	2.34	n.s.
Total Nurturance	3.88	3.54	n.s.	3.54	3.91	<0.20	3.88	3.91	n.s.
Mother Punishment	3.18	3.59	<0.20	3.59	3.12	<0.10	3.18	3.12	n.s.
Father Punishment	4.18	4.65	<0.10	4.65	4.33	<0.20	4.18	4.33	n.s.
Total Punishment	7.36	8.25	<0.10	8.25	7.45	<0.10	7.36	7.45	n.s.
Mother Physical Punishment	1.11	1.66	<0.05	1.66	1.36	<0.20	1.11	1.36	<0.30
Father Physical Punishment	2.21	2.56	<0.30	2.56	2.33	n.s.	2.21	2.33	n.s.
Mother Overpermissiveness	0.09	0.02	<0.05	0.02	0.07	<0.10	0.09	0.07	n.s.
Father Overpermissiveness	0.09	0.11	n.s.	0.11	0.14	n.s.	0.09	0.14	<0.30
Mother Power	4.75	5.05	n.s.	5.05	4.68	<0.30	4.75	4.68	n.s.
Father Power	6.49	6.73	n.s.	6.73	6.66	n.s.	6.49	6.66	n.s.
Mother Interaction	5.49	5.99	<0.10	5.99	5.59	<0.20	5.49	5.59	n.s.
Father Interaction	7.03	7.44	<0.10	7.44	7.41	n.s.	7.03	7.41	<0.10

*High Masculinity Group.
**Low Masculinity Group.
†Probabilities given are for two - tailed t tests.
‡Intermediate Masculinity Group.

If it be assumed that overpermissiveness on the part of a parent, as defined in the study, is not associated with positive personality characteristics in a child, it is not clear why the boys in the High Masculinity Group perceived their mothers as significantly more overpermissive than the Low Masculinity Group. It could be that the boys' responses perceived by the authors as indicating overpermissiveness were actually perceived by the boys as manifestations of nurturance. Correspondingly, families of highly masculine boys in a study by Mussen and Distler (31) were rated as permissive and easy-going.

No significant difference was noted between the three groups in Mother or Father Power. The boys in the Low Masculinity Group tended to perceive a greater degree of interaction with their mothers and fathers than the High Masculinity Group. Since the Low Masculinity Group scored consistently lower in the parent nurturance categories and consistently higher in the parent punishment categories than the High Masculinity Group, it would seem that the interaction with the father and mother perceived by the boys low in masculinity was characterized more by punishment than the interaction perceived by the boys high in masculinity. In general, the High and Intermediate Masculinity Groups were more similar than the Low Masculinity Group was to either group.

Selected Personality Characteristics of
Boys with Varying Masculinity Ratings

Utilizing further the data on the entire sample, it was hypothesized that significant differences would be found between boys rating high, low, and in the middle range of masculinity with respect to (1) their self-conceptions, (2) other selected personality characteristics, and (3) their peers' rating of them. The mean scores in the personality characteristics

of boys with varying masculinity ratings are given in Table 5. The High and Intermediate Masculinity Groups were significantly better adjusted than the Low Masculinity Group, as measured by the California Test of Personality. While the High Masculinity Group scored significantly higher in personal and social adjustment than the Low Masculinity Group, the significant difference in total adjustment between the Intermediate and Low Masculinity Groups seems to be attributable mainly to the difference in their personal adjustment.

Specifically, the High Masculinity Group had a greater sense of personal freedom and feeling of belonging, was less withdrawing, had higher social standards, had less anti-social tendencies, tended to have better family and community relations, and had better relations at school than the Low Masculinity Group.

The Low Masculinity Group also had significantly less positive self-conceptions, as compared with the High and Intermediate Masculinity Groups, while the two latter groups did not differ from each other in this regard. No significant differences in the anxiety reactions of the three groups were noted.

In general, the High and Intermediate Masculinity Groups seem more similar to each other in the characteristics listed in Table 5 than the Low Masculinity Group is, in relation to either group. Only one significant difference emerged between the high and intermediate groups, the High Masculinity Group being better adjusted socially. Apparently, the functional relationships between masculinity and certain personality characteristics are curvilinear.[12] To illustrate, the Low Masculinity Group scored significantly

---

[12]Before the boys were divided into three groups according to masculinity, the product moment correlation coefficients between masculinity and each of the personality characteristics measured by the California Test of Personality were computed and are reported in Table 10, Appendix B. Since the product moment correlation assumes linearity, the association between masculinity and the other variables may have been underestimated.

TABLE 5

PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF BOYS
WITH VARYING MASCULINITY RATINGS

Personality Variable	Mean: High Masc. Group* n=89	Mean: Low Masc. Group** n=96	p†	Mean: Low Masc. Group n=96	Mean: Int. Masc. Group‡ n=150	p	Mean: High Masc. Group n=89	Mean: Int. Masc. Group n=150	p
California Test of Personality									
Self-Reliance- - - - - - - - -	6.09	6.02	n.s.	6.02	6.04	n.s.	6.09	6.04	n.s.
Sense of Personal Worth - - -	6.53	6.21	<0.20	6.21	6.27	n.s.	6.53	6.27	<0.30
Sense of Personal Freedom- - -	6.33	5.86	<0.02	5.86	6.05	n.s.	6.33	6.05	<0.20
Feeling of Belonging - - - - -	6.79	6.30	<0.02	6.30	6.65	<0.10	6.79	6.65	n.s.
Freedom from Withdrawing Tendencies- -	5.81	5.14	<0.05	5.14	5.83	<0.02	5.81	5.83	n.s.
Freedom from Nervous Symptoms-	5.18	4.76	<0.20	4.76	5.60	<0.001	5.18	5.60	<0.10
Total Personal Adjustment-	36.72	34.29	<0.01	34.29	36.43	<0.01	36.72	36.43	n.s.
Social Standards - - - - - - -	6.55	6.06	<0.02	6.06	6.01	n.s.	6.55	6.01	n.s.
Social Skills - - - - - - - -	6.26	6.03	<0.30	6.03	6.18	n.s.	6.26	6.18	n.s.
Freedom from Anti-Social Tendencies- -	5.83	5.17	<0.02	5.17	5.51	<0.20	5.83	5.51	<0.30
Family Relations - - - - - - -	6.67	6.29	<0.10	6.29	6.43	n.s.	6.67	6.43	<0.30
School Relations - - - - - - -	6.43	5.88	<0.01	5.88	6.18	<0.20	6.43	6.18	<0.30
Community Relations- - - - - -	6.42	6.08	<0.10	6.08	6.22	n.s.	6.42	6.22	<0.30
Total Social Adjustment- -	38.17	35.52	<0.01	35.52	36.53	<0.30	38.17	36.53	<0.05
Total Adjustment- -	74.88	69.83	<0.01	69.83	72.95	<0.05	74.88	72.95	<0.20

*High Masculinity Group.
**Low Masculinity Group.
†Probabilities given are for two - tailed t tests.
‡Intermediate Masculinity Group.

TABLE 5 - Continued

Personality Variable	Mean: High Masc. Boys n=89	Mean: Low Masc. Boys n=96	p	Mean: Low Masc. Boys n=96	Mean: Int. Masc. Boys n=150	p	Mean: High Masc. Boys n=89	Mean: Int. Masc. Boys n=150	p
Self-Concept* - - - - - - - -	21.77	20.33	<0.001	20.33	21.58	<0.001	21.77	21.58	n.s.
Test for Anxiety Reactions									
Routine - - - - - - - - - -	0.29	0.30	n.s.	0.30	0.27	n.s.	0.29	0.27	n.s.
Child-Adult - - - - - - - -	0.44	0.44	n.s.	0.44	0.41	n.s.	0.44	0.41	n.s.
Child-Child - - - - - - - -	0.49	0.45	<0.30	0.45	0.48	<0.30	0.49	0.48	n.s.
Total Anxiety - - -	0.40	0.39	n.s.	0.39	0.38	n.s.	0.40	0.38	n.s.

*The number of boys was 86 for the High Masculinity Group, 145 for the Intermediate Masculinity Group, and 95 for the Low Masculinity Group.

lower in personal adjustment than the Intermediate and High Masculinity Groups, while the latter two groups were similar in the degree of personal adjustment.

Comparisons of peer evaluations of the three groups are reported in Table 6. Each of the boys in the High Masculinity Group had an average of 3.4 peer evaluations. The average number of evaluations for each of the boys in the Intermediate Masculinity Group was 3.7, while for the Low Masculinity Group, it was 3.4. The mean peer evaluation for each group was obtained by adding all the evaluations in a group and dividing the sum by the number of evaluations. It can be noted from Table 6 that the boys in the High Masculinity Group were regarded more favorably by their peers than the Intermediate and Low Masculinity Groups, while the peer evaluations of the two latter groups were similar.

TABLE 6

EVALUATION OF BOYS WITH VARYING MASCULINITY RATINGS BY THEIR PEERS

Group	Mean Peer Evaluation	p*
High Masculinity Group (n=86) Low Masculinity Group (n=95)	16.66 15.58	<0.01
Low Masculinity Group Intermediate Masculinity Group (n=145)	15.58 15.74	n.s.
High Masculinity Group Intermediate Masculinity Group	16.66 15.74	<0.01

*Probabilities given are for two-tailed t tests.

Present Results in Relation to Past Findings

While the High, Intermediate, and Low Masculinity Groups did not differ significantly in Mother, Father, or Total Nurturance, the boys in the Low Masculinity Group scored consistently lower in these categories and tended to view their parents as more punitive than the two other groups. Boys low in masculinity also perceived their mother as significantly harsher in disciplining. The data, therefore, seem to substantiate the developmental hypothesis of masculine identification.

However, contrary to the findings of Mussen and Distler (32), but in accord with the findings of Lefkowitz (28), sex-typing in boys was not solely determined by their interaction with their fathers, but also with their mothers. Lefkowitz found that a greater proportion of parents of boys manifesting sex-deviation than those of non-deviant boys reported that the mother was the chief disciplinarian. In the present study, as well, the boys low in masculinity viewed their mothers as using physical punishment in disciplining more often than those scoring higher in masculinity.

The data did not lend support to either the power theory or the defensive identification hypothesis. The boys in the Low Masculinity Group tended to perceive a greater extent of interaction with their mothers and fathers than the High Masculinity Group, although the interaction with parents perceived by the boys low in masculinity seemed characterized to a greater extent by punishment.

The findings further strengthen the positive association between masculinity in boys and favorable personality characteristics, as shown in past studies on elementary school boys and college students (22, 44). As noted in Gray's study (22) of sixth and seventh graders, highly masculine boys

were regarded favorably by their peers and were low in withdrawing tendencies. In general, the relationship between appropriate sex-typing and satisfactory social-personal adjustment is apparently already manifested in kindergarten-age boys.

On the other hand, the association between anxiety and masculinity in boys remains unclear. In Gray's study (22) a high level of anxiety was related to sex-appropriate behavior, while in the investigations by Lazowick (27) and Webb (48), the opposite relationship prevailed, that is, femininity in boys was associated with a high level of anxiety. The present study did not reveal any differences in the anxiety level of boys with varying masculinity ratings. It is, of course, possible that the test for anxiety reactions used lacks validity.

While favorable personality characteristics were associated with appropriate sex-typing behavior, and the more masculine boys tended to perceive their father as less punitive, yet, within a high masculinity group (those having masculinity scores from 79 to 84) boys classified according to their perception of father punishment and nurturance did not differ in the specific personality characteristics measured or in their degree of adjustment. When the high masculinity boys were classified according to the extent of their perceived interaction with the father, their degree of adjustment was again similar. They also did not differ in the specific personality characteristics measured, except in a few instances.

If actual differences do exist, one explanation for not having found them may be inadequate sensitivity of the test for the perception of parent-child relationships, at least when used on the high masculinity group. On the other hand, it is possible that some boys achieve masculine identification and function normally as a result of additional variables not considered

in the present study. Among such influences might be included the constitution of the individual and the availability of other models, such as siblings, relatives, or friends.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Various theories suggest three mechanisms promoting masculine identification in a boy: (1) warmth and nurturance of the father, (2) punitiveness of the father, and (3) nurturance together with punitiveness of the father. The primary objective of the study was to compare the personality characteristics of boys whose masculine identification is based on each of these three mechanisms. Specifically, do boys who rate high in masculinity and perceive their father as nurturant have more positive self-concepts and other personality characteristics, as compared with those who also rate high in masculinity but perceive their father as either punitive or both punitive and nurturant?

Since only a fraction of the group of boys studied was classified in the high masculinity range, two other objectives were formulated, utilizing the entire sample: (1) to compare boys with varying masculinity ratings with regard to their perception of the degree of nurturance or punitiveness of their parents, and (2) to compare the personality characteristics, reputation, and self-conceptions of boys with varying masculinity ratings.

A total of 335 boys participated in the study, 326 of whom were completely tested while 9 boys were only partially tested. All boys were white, native-born Americans. Their mean age was 67 months. All came from unbroken families and from households including only parents and their children. About two thirds of the boys had fathers who were skilled craftsmen or semi-skilled and unskilled laborers.

Each boy was tested individually at school. The tests administered were— (1) the It Scale for Children which was used as a test of the degree

of masculinity, (2) the California Test of Personality, (3) a test for anxiety reactions, (4) a test for self-concept and peer-evaluation, and (5) a test for the perception of parent-child relationships.

The first hypothesis tested was that significant differences would be found in the self-conceptions and other personality characteristics of boys, all rating high in masculinity, who perceived their fathers differently--(1) as nurturant, (2) as punitive, and (3) as both punitive and nurturant. However, none of the 136 boys classified in the high masculinity range perceived their father as both high in nurturance and punishment, as defined in the study. The boys in the high masculinity range were, therefore, divided into the following groups: (1) those who perceived their father as nurturant, (2) those who perceived their father as punitive, and (3) those who perceived their father as both relatively low in nurturance and punishment. No significant differences were found in the self-conceptions and other personality characteristics of the three groups of boys. When the boys in the high masculinity range were divided into three groups according to their perceived interaction with their fathers, the groups were again very similar in the degree of positiveness of their self-conceptions and in the other personality characteristics measured. The first hypothesis, at least when applied to the boys in the high masculinity range who perceived their father as nurturant and those who perceived their father as punitive, was not confirmed. Apparently, the personality characteristics of relatively high masculinity boys develop independently of the identification mechanisms considered.

The second hypothesis, that significant differences would be found between boys in the high, low, and middle ranges of masculinity with

respect to their perception of the degree of punitiveness or nurturance of their parents, was partially supported by the data. The boys low in masculinity tended to perceive their parents as more punitive than the boys in the two other groups. The low masculinity boys also perceived their mothers as significantly harsher in punishing than the high masculinity boys did. While the three groups of boys did not differ in their perceptions of the degree of nurturance of their parents, the low masculinity boys scored consistently lower than the two other groups in the parent nurturance categories.

The third hypothesis, that significant differences would be found between boys in the high, low, and middle ranges of masculinity with respect to (1) their self-conceptions, (2) other selected personality characteristics, and (3) their peers' rating of them, was partially confirmed. The boys rating high and those in the middle range of masculinity were significantly better adjusted than the low masculinity boys. The high masculinity boys had a greater sense of personal freedom and feeling of belonging, were less withdrawing, had higher social standards, had less anti-social tendencies, tended to have better family and community relations, and had better relations at school than the low masculinity boys.

The low masculinity boys had significantly less positive self-conceptions, as compared with the high masculinity boys and those in the middle range. Furthermore, the high masculinity boys were regarded more favorably by their peers than the boys low in masculinity or those in the middle range. In general, the boys in the high and middle ranges of masculinity were more similar in the characteristics measured than the low masculinity boys were, in relation to either group. Thus, it appears

that the functional relationships between masculinity and certain personality characteristics are curvilinear; that is, a boy need not be ruggedly masculine in interests in order to have a satisfactory degree of adjustment. This interpretation is in accord with Bronson's (7) finding that boys manifesting ego identification were overtly characterized by moderation in masculinity.

APPENDIX A

TEST FOR ANXIETY REACTIONS
TEST FOR SELF-CONCEPT AND PEER-EVALUATION
TEST FOR PERCEPTION OF PARENT-CHILD RELATIONSHIPS

Test for Anxiety Reactions (14)

The following statements were used in presenting the pictures:

1. Play with Younger Children. "What kind of a face do you suppose this child will have, a happy face or a sad face? He is playing with some younger children."

2. Child with Mother and Baby. "What kind of a face do you suppose this child will have, a sad face or a happy face? He is taking a walk with his mother and baby."

3. Object of Aggression. "What kind of a face do you suppose this child will have, a happy face or a sad face?"

4. Dressing. "What kind of a face do you suppose this child will have, a sad face or a happy face? He is dressing."

5. Play with Older Children. "What kind of a face do you suppose this child will have, a happy face or a sad face? He is playing with some older children."

6. Going to Bed Alone. "What kind of a face do you suppose this child will have, a sad face or a happy face? He is going to bed."

7. Toileting. "What kind of a face do you suppose this child will have, a happy face or a sad face? He is using the bathroom."

8. Scolding. "What kind of a face do you suppose this child will have, a sad face or a happy face?"

9. Neglect. "What kind of a face do you suppose this child will have, a happy face or a sad face?"

10. Aggressive Attack. "What kind of a face do you suppose this child will have, a sad face or a happy face?"

11. Picking up Toys. "What kind of a face do you suppose this child will have, a sad face or a happy face? He is picking up toys."

12. Isolation. "What kind of a face do you suppose this child will have, a sad face or a happy face?"

13. Child with Parents. "What kind of a face do you suppose this child will have, a happy face or a sad face? He is with his mother and father."

14. Eating Alone. "What kind of a face do you suppose this child will have, a sad face or a happy face? He is eating."

Test for Self-Concept and Peer-Evaluation[13]

INTRODUCTION

See these pretty little boxes. Would you point to the one that you like best. Yes, this is a cute box, isn't it? Now I'll clip this 1 on it to show that you like it best (and I'll move it over here in the first place). Now will you point to the box you like second best? Yes, that is a nice one also. We'll clip a 2 on it to show that you like it second best (and I'll move it over here to the second place). And we'll put a 3 on this other box to show that you like it third best.

Here are some snapshots of the people in your class. Do you remember when we took these pictures? Let's see if you know each person's picture.

(Well, that's fine)

Now as you well know every person has some things he can do very, very well and some things he can do pretty well but not as well as some other people can do this, and some things he can't do very well yet.

ART

What is going on in this picture? Yes, the boy is painting. He is doing art work. There are some people who are very, very good in art. They can paint and color so well that everyone thinks their pictures are the best ones in kindergarten, and they like to paint and color so well that they do this real often. Then there are other people who can paint and color pretty well, but they probably aren't the best in the class. And then there are some people who don't do so well in art. In choosing time they probably wouldn't want to paint or color very often.

Will you put in the first box the pictures of the people who are the best in art? And in the second box put the pictures of the people who are pretty good but not the best. And in the third box put the pictures of the people who aren't so good in art.

PHYSICAL ABILITY

What are the people doing in this picture? Yes, they are playing outside. Now there are some people who are very, very good in playing outside. They can throw and catch balls real well and run very fast, and they are very good on the bars and rings and at tether ball. Then there are some people who do fairly well in playing outside. They can catch the ball some of the time and

---

[13]The above test is a copy of the instrument received from Dr. Pauline Sears of Stanford University. Some modifications of the original form were made to render it more applicable to the present subjects. Thus, the first area, "school work," was deleted and a few sentences were modified.

run fairly fast and they're pretty good on the bars and rings and at tether ball. And then there are some people who aren't very good at playing outside. They can't throw or catch a ball too well, and they don't run very fast either or do too well on the bars or rings or at tether ball.

Will you put in the first box the people who are the very best in outside play. . . . . .

You are trying to use all three boxes, aren't you?

PHYSICAL APPEARANCE

I'm sure you've noticed that there are some people who are so nice to look at. I guess we could say that the boys are very good looking and the girls are very pretty. Other people are fairly nice to look at and then there are people who aren't very nice to look at yet.

Will you put in the first box the people who are really nice to look at and . . . . . .

SHARING

What are the people doing in this picture? Yes, they're having a sharing time. You have sharing in your room, don't you? Well, some boys and girls like to share real often. These children like to bring things to show to the class real often and tell about things they have done. Others like to share sometimes and some people never or almost never share.

Would you . . . . . .

HAPPY QUALITIES

Have you ever noticed how some boys and girls seem to enjoy themselves so much? They seem to have so much pep and they always seem to be having lots of fun. We would say that these are very happy boys and girls. Other children seem fairly lively and happy. They enjoy themselves sometimes but not always. And other people don't seem to enjoy themselves or have much fun at all.

Would you put in the first box the people who seem very happy . . . . . .

And now would you . . . . . .

GOOD IDEAS

You've probably noticed how some of the boys and girls in the class always seem to have such good ideas. These people can think of such good things to do and good ways to do them. We think of these people as being very smart. Other people are fairly smart; they have pretty good ideas. And other people do not seem very smart yet; they do not have or hardly ever have good ideas.

Would you put in the first box the people who have very good ideas and are very smart and . . . . . .

PAYING ATTENTION

Now as you well know there are some people who are very, very good listeners. They don't interrupt or bother their neighbors when the teacher or someone else is talking and they listen carefully enough to follow any directions that may have been given. Other children are fairly good listeners. They don't interrupt too often and they usually can remember directions. And some people are pretty poor listeners. They interrupt whoever is talking and can hardly ever follow directions.

Would you put in the first box the people who are very good listeners. . .

FRIENDS

Have you ever noticed that some boys and girls seem to be liked by others so much? They have many friends and get along with others real well. And then, there are other boys and girls who are fairly well liked and get along all right with others. Other children are not liked at all. They don't seem to know how to make friends.

Would you put in the first box the children who have many friends. . . .

Test for Perception of Parent-Child Relationships[14]

Story Beginnings

1. Both mother and father dolls sitting on the living room couch.
   Child doll of same sex.
   "The child wants a certain toy.
   He can't reach the toy.
   He goes into the living room to get help.
   Both Mommy and Daddy are busy reading — what happens?"

2. The mother and father dolls sitting on couch. Child doll of the same sex.
   "The child was very bad.
   Mommy and Daddy said, 'You are a bad boy, go to bed.'
   The child gets ready for bed.
   He wants to say, 'I'm sorry.'
   He goes into the living room.
   Mommy and Daddy are busy watching T.V.--what happens?"

3. Mother and daddy dolls in the back room. Child in front.
   "The child lives on a very busy street.
   Mommy and Daddy told him never to cross the street alone.
   The child is playing in the front yard, and Mommy and Daddy are not there.
   A friend is on the other side of the street playing with his new bike.
   The child wants to cross the street very bad. What happens?"

---

[14]The above test is a copy of the instrument received from Dr. Paul Mussen of the University of California.

4. Mother and father dolls on the couch and child on the floor.

"The child is having fun playing with his toys.

Mother and Daddy say, 'It's bed time now.'

The child says, 'I don't want to go to bed now.'

Then the child throws a toy on the floor and it breaks.

What happens?"

5. Mother and father dolls sitting on the couch.

"The child is getting ready to go to school.

He has a knot in his shoelaces.

He can't fix it. What happens?"

6. Mother, father and child dolls sitting at the dinner table.

Child sitting between parents.

"The child, Mommy and Daddy are having dinner.

The child says, 'Not hungry anymore. I want to go play.'

So the child gets up from the table.

And as he gets up he puts his hand in the plate and knocks it to the floor.

The food spills all over the floor. What happens?"

7. The mother doll sitting at the table.

"Mother was looking at some pretty pictures on the table.

She lets the child look at the pictures.

She leaves the room.

There is a bottle of ink on the table.

The child spills the bottle of ink on the pretty pictures.

What happens?"

8. "The mother gives the child a new toy.
She tells the child to be very careful with it because it might break.
She leaves the room.
The child is having fun playing with his new toy.
The toy breaks--the pretty new toy breaks. What happens?"

9. "Daddy has just planted some pretty flowers in the yard.
Daddy tells the child not to step on the pretty flowers.
The child is playing with his ball and steps all over the pretty flowers.
What happens?"

APPENDIX B

TABLES NOT INCLUDED IN THE TEXT

TABLE 7

MASCULINITY RATINGS OF BOYS WITHIN A HIGH MASCULINITY RANGE WHO PERCEIVE THEIR FATHER IN DIFFERENT WAYS

Group	n	Mean Masculinity Rating
Boys perceiving their father as nurturant (HFN, LFP)	30	83.3
Boys perceiving their father as punitive (LFN, HFP)	31	83.4
Boys perceiving their father as relatively low in nurturance and punishment (LFN, LFP)	75	83.5

TABLE 8

MASCULINITY RATINGS OF BOYS WITHIN A HIGH MASCULINITY RANGE WITH VARYING DEGREES OF INTERACTION WITH THEIR FATHER

Group	n	Mean Masculinity Rating
High Father Interaction	58	83.4
Moderate Father Interaction	34	83.3
Low Father Interaction	44	83.6

TABLE 9

COMPARISON BETWEEN HIGH AND LOW MASCULINITY GROUPS ON PARENT PERCEPTION CATEGORIES

Category	Group with Higher Scores	p*
Mother Overpermissiveness	Highs	<0.07
Father Overpermissiveness	-	n.s.
Mother Physical Punishment	Lows	<0.03
Father Physical Punishment	Lows	<0.25

*The White Test was applied to test the significance of differences.

TABLE 10

CORRELATION BETWEEN MASCULINITY AND PERSONALITY VARIABLES (n=335)

Personality Variable	r	p
Self-Reliance	-0.02	n.s.
Sense of Personal Worth	0.08	n.s.
Sense of Personal Freedom	0.11	n.s.
Feeling of Belonging	0.15	<0.05
Freedom from Withdrawing Tendencies	0.12	<0.05
Freedom from Nervous Symptoms	0.13	<0.05
Personal Adjustment	0.16	<0.01
Social Standards	0.03	n.s.
Social Skills	0.03	n.s.
Anti-Social Tendencies	0.09	n.s.
Family Relations	0.03	n.s.
School Relations	0.10	n.s.
Community Relations	0.10	n.s.
Social Adjustment	0.10	n.s.
Total Adjustment	0.28	<0.01

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

1. Angrielli, Albert. "The Psychosexual Identification of Pre-School Boys," Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1960, 97, 329-340.

2. Baldwin, A. L. "Socialization and the Parent-Child Relationship," Child Development, 1948, 19, 127-136.

3. Bandura, A. and Huston, A. C. "Identification as a Process of Incidental Learning," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 63, 311-318.

4. Beier, B. G. and Rotzeburg, F. "The Parental Identification of Male and Female College Students," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1953, 48, 569-572.

5. Brim, Orville. "Family Structure and Sex Role Learning by Children: A Further Analysis of Helen Koch's Data," Sociometry, 1958, 21, 1-16.

6. Bronfenbrenner, Urie. "Freudian Theories of Identification and Their Derivatives," Child Development, 1960, 31, 15-40.

7. Bronson, Wanda. "Dimension of Ego and Infantile Identification," Journal of Personality, 1959, 27, 532-545.

8. Brown, D. G. "Sex-Role Preference in Young Children," Psychological Monographs, 1956, 70, 1-19.

9. Buros, O. K. (ed.). The Fifth Mental Measurements Yearbook. New Jersey: Gryphon, 1959.

10. Cavan, Ruth. The American Family. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1955.

11. Clarke, Alfred C. "The Use of Leisure and Its Relation to Social Stratification." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1955.

12. Coppersmith, S. "A Method for Determining Types of Self-Esteem," Journal of Educational Psychology, 1959, 59, 87-94.

13. Dillon, M. S. "Attitudes of Children Toward Their Bodies and Those of Other Children," Child Development, 1934, 5, 165-176.

14. Dorkey, M. and Amen, E. W. "A Continuation Study of Anxiety Reactions in Young Children by Means of a Projective Technique," Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1947, 35, 139-183.

15. Emmerich, Walter. "Parental Identification in Young Children," Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1959, 60, 257-308.

16. Fauls, Lydia and Smith, Walter. "Sex-Role Learning of Five-Year-Olds," Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1956, 89, 105-117.

17. Freud, Anna. The Ego and the Mechanisms of Defense. New York: International University Libraries, 1946.

18. Freud, S. Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego. New York: Liveright Publishing Corporation, 1949.

19. Freud, S. "On Narcissism: An Introduction," in Collected Papers, Vol. IV. London: Hogarth, 1925, 30-59.

20. Freud, S. "The Passing of the Oedipus-Complex," in Collected Papers, Vol. II. London: Hogarth, 1924, 269-282.

21. Freud, S. "Some Psychological Consequences of the Anatomical Distinctions between the Sexes," in Collected Papers, Vol. V. London: Hogarth, 1950, 186-197.

22. Gray, Susan. "Masculinity-Femininity in Relation to Anxiety and Social Acceptance," Child Development, 1957, 28, 203-214.

23. Gray, Susan. "Perceived Similarity to Parents and Adjustment," Child Development, 1959, 30, 91-107.

24. Hartup, W. and Zook, E. "Sex-Role Preference in Three- and Four-Year-Old Children," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1960, 24, 420-426.

25. Johnson, Miriam. "Sex-Role Learning in the Nuclear Family," Child Development, 1963, 34, 319-333.

26. Jourard, S. "Identification, Parent-Cathexis, and Self-Esteem," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1957, 21, 375-380.

27. Lazowick, Lionel. "On the Nature of Identification," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 51, 175-183.

28. Lefkowitz, M. "Some Relationships Between Sex Role Preference of Children and Other Parent and Child Variables," Psychological Reports, 1962, 10, 43-53.

29. McCandless, Boyd R. Children and Adolescents. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

30. Mowrer, O. H. "Identification: A Link between Learning Theory and Psychotherapy," in Learning Theory and Personality Dynamics. New York: Ronald, 1950, 573-616.

31. Mussen, Paul and Distler, Luther. "Child-Rearing Antecedents of Masculine Identification in Kindergarten Boys," Child Development, 1960, 31, 89-100.

32. Mussen, Paul and Distler, Luther. "Masculinity, Identification, and Father-Son Relationship," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 59, 350-356.

33. Mussen, Paul and Rutherford, E. "Parent-Child Relations and Parental Personality in Relation to Young Children's Sex-Role Preferences," Child Development, 1963, 34, 589-607.

34. National Opinion Research Center. "Jobs and Occupations: A Popular Evaluation," Opinion News, 1947, 9, 3-13.

35. Parsons, T. and Bales, R. F. Family, Socialization and Interaction Process. Illinois: Free Press, 1955.

36. Parsons, T., Bales, R. F., and Shils, E. A. Working Papers in the Theory of Action. Illinois: Free Press, 1953.

37. Payne, D. and Mussen, P. "Parent-Child Relations and Father Identification Among Adolescent Boys," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1956, 52, 358-362.

38. Rabban, M. "Sex-Role Identification in Young Children in Two Diverse Social Groups," Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1950, 42, 81-158.

39. Radke, M. J. "The Relation of Parental Authority to Children's Behavior and Attitudes," University of Minnesota Institute of Child Welfare Monograph, 1946, No. 22.

40. Sanford, Nevitt. "The Dynamics of Identification," Psychological Review, 1955, 62, 106-117.

41. Sears, Pauline. "Child-Rearing Factors Related to Playing of Sex-Typed Roles," American Psychologist, 1953, 8, 431 (abstract).

42. Sears, Robert R. "Identification as a Form of Behavior Development," in D. B. Harris (ed.), The Concept of Development. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1957, 149-161.

43. Sears, R. R., Maccoby, E., and Levin, H. Patterns of Child Rearing. Evanston: Row, Peterson, 1957.

44. Sopchak, A. "Parental Identification and Tendency Toward Disorders as Measured by the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory," 1952, 47, 159-165.

45. Stokes, Seward M. "An Inquiry into the Concept of Identification" Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1950, 76, 163-189.

46. Stolz, Lois. "Effects of Maternal Employment on Children: Evidence from Research," Child Development, 1960, 31, 749-782.

47. Symonds, P. M. The Dynamics of Parent-Child Relationships. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University Press, 1949.

48. Webb, A. "Sex-Role Preferences and Adjustment in Early Adolescents," Child Development, 1963, 34, 609-618.